



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,055	10/14/2008	Vesa Myllymaki	BGG0002US	6188
23413	7590	10/01/2010	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN LLP			QIAN, YUN	
20 Church Street			ART UNIT	
22nd Floor			PAPER NUMBER	
Hartford, CT 06103			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/01/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/585,055	Applicant(s) MYLLYMAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner YUN QIAN	Art Unit 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-17 remain for examination.

Previous Grounds of Rejection

Regarding claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-15 and 17, the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection as being unpatentable over copending Application No.10/568,458 in view of IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A) stands.

Regarding claims 1-2, 9-14 and 17, the rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) as being unpatentable over Swatloski et al. (WO 03/029329), in view of IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A) stands.

Regarding claims 3-8 and 15-16, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swatloski et al. (WO 03/029329) IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A), further in view of Bergstrom et al. (US 4,000,032) stands.

Previous Grounds of Rejection

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Art Unit: 1793

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-15 and 17 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 12, 14 and 19 of copending Application No.10/568,458 in view of IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-6, 12, 14 and 19 of the copending Application No. 10/568,458 teaches a method for delignocellulosic of the lignocellulosic materials with an ionic liquid assisted in microwave irradiation and/or pressure.

Lignocellulosic material is a combination of lignin, hemicellulose, and cellulose. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the method for treatment of lignocellulosic material of copending Application 10/568,458 to treat a simpler molecular of polysaccharide (starch), as it is clearly demonstrated by IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG, who applies the process of the depolymerization to both starch and celluloses (cotton, paper pulp) (Examples 1 and 8, claim 1). Since both of them teach depolymerization of high

Art Unit: 1793

molecular weight of carbohydrates (starch and celluloses), one would have a reasonable expectation of success.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1793

Claims 1-2, 9-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) as being unpatentable over Swatloski et al. (WO 03/029329), in view of IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A).

Regarding claim 1, Swatloski et al. teaches a method for dissolving cellulose in an ionic liquid with agitation and heating under microwave irradiation at $<150^{\circ}\text{C}$ (abstract, page 4, paragraph 4).

However, Swatloski et al. does not specifically disclose a method for dissolving starch as per applicant claim 1.


Although cellulose (β -D-glucose) and starch (α -D-glucose) have similar structures (polymer of glucose monomer), cellulose poses more challenges to hydrolyze due to its higher crystalline and lower solubility in solution. Since the process of Swatloski et al. dissolves a cellulose material, one skilled in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success for dissolving a less crystalline starch material with the conditions taught by Swatloski et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the method for treatment of cellulose of Swatloski et al. to treat a simpler molecular polysaccharide (starch), as it is clearly demonstrated by IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG, who applies the process of the depolymerization for both starch and celluloses (cotton, paper pulp) (Examples 1 and 8, claim 1). Since both of them teach depolymerization of high molecular weight of carbohydrates (starch and celluloses), one would have a reasonable expectation of success.

Art Unit: 1793

Regarding claim 2 as discussed above, the process taught by Swatloski et al. includes microwave irradiation.

Regarding claims 9-11 and 17, the cation of the ionic liquid solvent taught by Swatloski et al. is selected from group consisting of:



The cation comprises imidazolium and the anion is halogen. It meets the claimed limitations (page 5, and claim 55).

Art Unit: 1793

Regarding claims 12-14, the process taught by Swatloski et al. comprising separating the product by adding a non-solvent (water, alcohol, or ketone) to precipitate the product (claims 44-51 and 60).

Claims 3-8 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swatloski et al. (WO 03/029329) IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A), further in view of Bergstrom et al. (US 4,000,032).

Regarding claims 3 and 15, although Swatloski et al. teaches a method for dissolving cellulose in an ionic liquid with agitation and heating under microwave irradiation at $<150^{\circ}\text{C}$, he does not specifically teach applying pressure to assist in dissolution as per applicant claims 3 and 15.

Bergstrom et al., also drawn to processes for the disruption or destruction (depolymerization) of the natural structure of the long chain polymeric polysaccharides (lignocellulose), via microwave irradiation, teaches that, if desired, superatomic and subatomic pressures can be used. (Abstract, col. 4, lines 43-49. col.5, Example, claims 9-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bergstrom et al. and Swatloski et al. and IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A) to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 3 and 15, motivated by the fact that the process with subatomic

Art Unit: 1793

pressure increases the disruptive or disintegrating effect on structure of the lignocellulosic material (Bergstrom et al. col. 4, lines 50-54).

Regarding claim 4, the temperature taught by Bergstrom et al. is at least 70 °C as per applicant claim 4 (claim 2).

Regarding claims 5, the process time taught by Bergstrom et al. is determined based on the nature of material itself and weight of material. For example, a 10-Kg pine chips per minute is treated with steam for four minutes at a temperature of 100 °C and ground at a pressure of 0.32 MPa in a disc mill, to which 475 kilowatts of power is supplied (Col.5, Example).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the process conditions, i. e., the temperature, reaction time, stoichiometric, etc. to achieve an acceptable yield and purity of product, particularly in view of the fact that;

“The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages”, In re Peterson 65 USPQ2d 1379 (CAFC 2003).

Also, In re Geisler 43 USPQ2d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (CCPA 1976); In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549, 553 (CCPA 1974) and MPEP 2144.05.

Regarding claims 6-7, the examiner realizes that not all properties of products are stated in the references. Since the references teach all of the claimed reagents

Art Unit: 1793

and conditions, therefore, the same starting starches would expect to be depolymerized into the same products as instantly claimed.

Regarding claim 8, the ionic liquid solvent taught by Swatloski et al. is molten at a temperature $<150^{\circ}\text{C}$ (claim 6). It is encompassed by the recited claim.

Regarding claim 16, the temperature taught by Bergstrom et al. is at least 70°C . It overlaps the claimed ranges. The references differ from Applicant's recitations of claims by not disclosing identical ranges. However, the reference discloses "overlapping" ranges, and overlapping ranges have been held to establish prima facie obviousness (MPEP 2144.05).

Response to Arguments

With regards to the previous Grounds of Rejection

Applicant's arguments filed on July 21, 2010, have been considered but are not persuasive. The examiner would like to take this opportunity to address the Applicant's arguments.

Regarding claims 1-2, 9-14, and 17 as being unpatentable over Swatloski in view of GB290377A, applicants argue (1) a skilled person would not combine Swatloski and GB290377A; (2) even if a skilled person had combined Swatloski and GB290377A, those references provide no expectation that starch could be selectively depolymerized as demonstrated by the instant application (Remarks, pages 5-8).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the

Art Unit: 1793

claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

In this case, Swatloski et al. teaches a method for dissolving cellulose in an ionic liquid with agitation and heating under microwave irradiation at $<150^{\circ}\text{C}$. The ionic liquid and process conditions are the same as the instant application (abstract, page 4, paragraph 4).

Although, Swatloski et al. does not specifically disclose a method for dissolving starch as per applicant claim 1, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the method for treatment of cellulose of Swatloski et al. to treat a simpler molecular polysaccharide (starch), as it is clearly demonstrated by IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG, who applies the process of the **depolymerization for both starch and celluloses** (cotton, paper pulp) (Examples 1 and 8, claim 1).

Furthore, since both of them teach depolymerization of high molecular weight of carbohydrates (starch and celluloses), one would have a reasonable expectation of success.

Therefore, the rejection as set forth in the office action mailed on March 25, 2010 stands.

Art Unit: 1793

Applicants further argue one skilled person seeking to modify Swatloski's cellulose regeneration method would not go back over 70 years to a reference such as GB290377A to draw an analogy between cellulose and starch based on their behavior in a conventional solvent degradation processes (Remarks, page 6).

In response to applicant's argument based upon the age of the references, contentions that the reference patents are old are not impressive absent a showing that the art tried and failed to solve the same problem notwithstanding its presumed knowledge of the references. See *In re Wright*, 569 F.2d 1124, 193 USPQ 332 (CCPA 1977).

Furthermore, applicants argue that GB290377A is teaching away from the instant application. It cannot be expected that different solvents (glycerine versus monochlorhydrine) would function similarly for cellulose and starch. This teaching is clearly contrary to the Office's suggestion that a skilled person would have applied the Swatloski process to both cellulose and starch (Remarks, page 7).

The Examiner respectfully submits GB290377A teaches a process for the manufacture of new products of depolymerization or degradation from carbohydrates of high molecular weight as, for example, various types of starch and cellulose, in which a carbohydrate is treated with ethylene glycol or monochlorhydrine or mixtures thereof until the required degree of degradation is obtained (claim 1). In other words, GB290377A teaches a certain concept, namely the process of depolymerization for

Art Unit: 1793

both starch and celluloses, and in combination with the Swatloski et al., discloses the presently claimed invention as set forth in the office action mailed on March 25, 2010.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning (Remarks, page 7), it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In addition, applicants argue that Swatloski is concerned with converting cellulose into a different form rather than depolymerizing cellulose. So, a person seeking to depolymerize cellulose would not start with the regeneration method of Swatloski (Remarks, pages 8-9).

Applicant's arguments against the reference of Swatloski et al. are not found persuasive. Swatloski et al. teaches a method for dissolving cellulose in an ionic liquid (the same reagent as the instant application) with agitation and heating under microwave irradiation at $<150^{\circ}\text{C}$ (abstract, page 4, paragraph 4).

Since the references (Swatloski et al. and GB290377A), as combined, teach all of the claimed reagents and composition, as the process conditions, the physical

Art Unit: 1793

properties of resulting product (i.e. depolymerizing starch) would necessarily follow as set forth in MPEP 2112.01(II).¹

Regarding claims 3-8 and 15-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swatloski et al. (WO 03/029329) IG FARBENINDUSTRIE AG (GB290377A), further in view of Bergstrom et al. (US 4,000,032), applicants argue Bergstrom does not cure the deficiencies of Swatloski and GB290377A because Bergstrom does not provide a reason for a skilled person to have combined Swatloski and GB290377A, nor does Bergstrom cure the failure of Swatloski and GB290377A to provide an expectation that starch could be selectively depolymerized (Remarks, pages 9-10).

Applicant's arguments against the reference of Bergstrom et al. are not found persuasive.

Because, note that while Bergstrom et al. do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, Bergstrom et al. is used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept, namely applying pressure to assist in dissolution, and in combination with the references of Swatloski et al. and

¹ "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties." A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Art Unit: 1793

GB290377A, discloses the presently claimed invention as set forth in the office action mailed on March 25, 2010.

Therefore, the rejection as set forth in the office action mailed on March 25, 2010 is proper and stands.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YUN QIAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 10:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Melvin Curtis Mayes can be reached on 571-272-1234. The

Art Unit: 1793

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Emily M. Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/YUN QIAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793